Volume LXXXVIII No. 7 May 3, 1968 35 cents

commonweal

St. Charles Seminary Library
Carthagena Station
Celina, Ohio
C-2-68

MARTIN LUTHER KING —UNSUNG THEOLOGIAN

Herbert Warren Richardson

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

COEXISTENCE IN NIGERIA

John Horgan

POLITICS IN INDIANA

Ralph Whitehead

NEW MAN AT H.E.W.

James J. Graham

FRAGMENTARY RADICALISM

Staughton Lynd

A-0505 12-68
ST CHARLES SEM LIBRARY
CARTHAGENA STATION
CELINA OH 45822

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEWS AND VIEWS

One would have to search far for an example of commercial contretemps to match that of Abercrombie & Fitch during the wake period of Martin Luther King. On April 8—four days after Dr. King's assassination and the day before the funeral—Abercrombie & Fitch took two columns of space in the New York *Times* to advertise its gun department and the availability of Rex Gage for private shooting lessons.

Mr. Gage, Abercrombie & Fitch gloried, is "one of the foremost instructors of England's renowned Holland & Holland shooting school." And to underscore his credentials, Abercrombie & Fitch offered a letter of recommendation from Norman T. Clarke, Holland & Holland's senior shooting instructor: "Mr. Gage . . . has had an extensive training by me. He teaches my system of how to shoot."

If all this weren't errancy enough, Clarke apologized that he wouldn't be at Abercrombie & Fitch's himself: "I am afraid I will not be able to see you in New York this spring, as I shall be visiting the West Coast and southern parts of the United States during April and part of May . . ."

Now, no one is charging there is something suspect about Mr. Gage's occupation, Abercrombie & Fitch's advertising or Mr. Clarke's itinerary. But four days after the King murder and the new evidence it provided of the American propensity for violence, there is something sick about the exaltation of guns and the shooting sports—since this is a land where anyone, balanced or not, can pop an order into the mails, or walk into Abercrombie & Fitch or any other sporting goods store, and freely purchase the guns and instruction that help make violence a way of life in America.

Admittedly, Article 2 of the Bill of Rights speaks of "the right of the people to keep and bear arms." But, as Gunnar Myrdal commented after Dr. King's murder, (a) the idea that everyone should be able to buy a gun is "silly," and (b) if the Constitution gives the people this right, "then to hell with the Constitution."

Myrdal is right, although the problem isn't in the Constitution. It's in the enactment of sensible gun control laws. Yet, strangely enough, to get such laws written is as tough a task as getting the Constitution amended, for one is in contention with the largest and perhaps most effective lobbying group in Washington, the National Rifle Association. The NRA just won't countenance broad gun control.

A week to the day after the King murder, NRA president Harold W. Glassen of Lansing allowed that the killing was "senseless" and "cruel," but in the same breath he argued that the King murder should have no effect on gun legislation. And, indeed, it won't, if the NRA has its way, as it likely will.

Hence, even in this tragic year, the best the nation can hope for is the mildest extension of gun control—a measure to ban interstate mail-order sales of pistols and other concealable weapons, and the prohibition of over-the-counter sales of hand-guns to out-of-state residents. Pretty weak legislation, with nothing, notice, on the regulation of rifles and other "long" weapons of the type that killed Dr. King and that are common to assassinations in America. The NRA lobby protects their sale.

At the National Rifle Association's recent convention in Boston, Massachusetts Lieutenant Governor Francis Sargent urged the NRA to spearhead gun control legislation instead of "either blocking it or offering mealy-mouthed plans that are more pablum than reform." The metaphor is bad but the thought is good.

Unfortunately, if the past offers any clue, it will go in one ear and out the other of the National Rifle Association, thus insuring that a wilful conspirator or anyone with a nutty idea in his head will still be able to drop into shops like Abercrombie & Fitch, pick out his gun, even get some coaching, and be about his business.

Purchasers defend this arrangement as a constitutional right, sellers as an inescapable merchandizing risk. History will label it lunacy.

•

Disgusted with that salacious mail which arrives unsolicited in the mailbox? For better or for worse, a solution is open to the badgered. Under Public Law 90-206, Title III, 39, U.S. Code, Sect. 4009, one has the right to declare to his local postmaster that a piece of unsolicited mail is "erotically arousing" or "sexually provocative" and the Postmaster General is obligated under Paragraph (b) to order the sender "to refrain from further mailings to the named addressees." Most importantly, the sender is also prohibited from selling, renting or exchanging mailing lists "bearing the names of the designated addressees." Moreover, the Post Office may not question the definition of what is "erotically arousing." It is the "sole discretion" of the recipient. All of which means open season on aggressive hucksters—and a court test on a regulation that is recklessly sweeping.

•

For the record: Catholic Relief Services, overseas aid agency of the U.S. bishops, will discontinue its food-in-lieu-of-pay program to South Vietnam's Popular Forces by June 30.

The program was instituted about two years ago, after the South Vietnamese government failed to provide a pay raise for the militia group, and has been under fire since news about the program became public late last summer. Critics have seen the program as perverting the nature of a charitable relief agency by involving it directly and nationalistically in the Vietnamese war effort.

Bishop Edward E. Swanstrom, CRS director, announced recently that new plans call for the supplementary food program to be handled by the appropriate military authorities. This will free CRS for work among refugees, Bishop Swanstrom declared.

Which, critics would add, is the way it should have been all along.

JOHN DEEDY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

Frying the Gooks

APO, San Francisco

To the Editors: While laying up in a hospital in Cam Ranh Bay recovering from wounds received in action with the North Vietnamese Army, I had the opportunity to read your exceptional article on napalm in the Jan. 12 issue. It sounded like an excerpt from an Army technical manual on ordnance and weapons' systems. It was an excellent move, I feel, to inform the public of this marvelous stuff which saves so many GIs each day. I've had several occasions to watch it up close and it has saved my life more than once. It splashes right down into enemy bunkers where conventional ordnance cannot penetrate and "fries" the gooks alive.

I realize, of course, the intention of the article was not to support the use of napalm, but think of the GI who is about to be overrun himself if the enemy positions aren't first knocked out. Remember, while the people back home argue the morality of the war, we over here have little time to think of anything but killing the enemy in order to survive. Napalm is an extremely effective means of doing so. It also deals a heavy psychological blow to the survivors of a napalm attack.

We soldiers want to come home—but until we are allowed to do so, allow us the use of the weapons to stay alive without condemnation. We *need* Dow Chemical. PFC. MARSHALL PAUL

Delaying the Inevitable

Philadelphia, Pa.

To the Editors: Father Daniel J. Mallette's recent account of the "controlled" city of Chicago makes Philadelphia look good by contrast, yet "repression" and "buying off discontent" are the most popular tools of Mayor Tate's administration. Although such tactics can only serve to delay the inevitable explosion in the ghettos, the white establishment cannot or will not open

(Continued on page 214)

NEWS & VIEWS: 194 **CORRESPONDENCE: 195**
EDITORIALS: 195
GERMAN STUDENTS ROCK THE ESTABLISHMENT: *Marjorie Hope* **197**
SENATOR LAUSCHE UNDERDOGS IT AGAIN: *John Barden* **198**
BACK HOME IN INDIANA: *Ralph Whitehead Jr.* **199**
MARTIN LUTHER KING: UNSUNG THEOLOGIAN:
Herbert Warren Richardson **201**
COEXISTENCE IN NIGERIA: *John Horgan* **203**
NEW MAN AT H.E.W.: *James J. Graham* **206**
THE SCREEN: *Philip T. Hartung* **207** ***THE STAGE:*** *John Simon* **208**
BOOKS: 209

JAMES O'GARA: *Editor*
DANIEL CALLAHAN: *Executive Editor* JOHN DEEDY: *Managing Editor*
PETER STEINFELS: *Associate Editor* OONA SULLIVAN: *Associate Editor*
ANNE ROBERTSON: *Editorial Assistant* JONATHAN EISEN: *Editorial Assistant*
MICHAEL NOVAK: *Associate Editor (At Large)* WILFRID SHEED: *Books*
JOHN SIMON: *Drama* PHILIP T. HARTUNG: *Movies* JOHN FANDEL: *Poetry*
ROBERT BARRAT: *Paris* GUNNAR D. KUMLIEN: *Rome* J. M. CAMERON: *Great Britain*
EDWARD S. SKILLIN: *Publisher*
JOHN BRUBAKER: *Advertising Manager*

COMMONWEAL A Weekly Review of Public Affairs, Literature and the Arts.
Second-class postage paid in Philadelphia, Pa. Printed in the USA and published weekly, except biweekly Christmas-New Year's and July-September,
by Commonweal Publishing Co, 232 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016
MUrray Hill 3-2042. Copyright © 1968 Commonweal Publishing Co., Inc.
US and Canada, $10 a year. Foreign $12. Single copies 35¢.

FLAWED INTENTIONS

It was expected that there would be a certain amount of quibbling in choosing a site for preliminary peace talks between the United States and North Vietnam, but the protracted and testy exchanges over where to meet have thrown a pall over early hopes that the two sides would at least begin the long process of negotiations fairly soon. The circumstances of the delay suggest that the hawks in the Johnson Administration and the military, temporarily thrown off balance by Johnson's combined peace initiative and announcement of retirement, have regained their composure—and the President's ear. In Honolulu he reassured South Korea's President Chung Hee Park, and by extension, all our other Asian allies from Tokyo to Bangkok, that America would remain faithful to its "abiding interest in Asia's freedom and in Asia's security." The President apparently intended the message for Hanoi, too, in the sense that there would be no weakening of American resolve in Asia, whether at peace talks or in battle. Unfortunately, back in Washington this resolve became transmuted into what looked like obstruction of negotiations.

In a disagreement within the State Department over whether to proffer another list of possible sites, after the first five were rejected by Hanoi and after the U.S. had turned down Cambodia and Warsaw, the President bowed to the "hard-liners," led by Walt W. Rostow (but not, to his credit, by Secretary Rusk). The U.S. was then put in the ludicrous position of violating its own conditions for a place and at the same time of doing just what it had criticized Hanoi for doing—suggesting sites where the other side or its allies had no diplomatic representation. The American ten even included Italy, Belgium and Pakistan, which are members of Western alliances, and Japan, which has supported U.S. policy in Vietnam. None could be considered "neutral" by any stretch of a definition. Perhaps the Rostow clique thought

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we could simply overwhelm or embarrass Hanoi with a profusion of names. If so, the quality of their judgment is questionable; more ominously, it calls into public doubt the seriousness of America's interest in getting peace talks started.

Meanwhile, the war in Vietnam has been raging with greater, not less intensity since the bombing restrictions. Although the U.S. has kept its raids below the 19th parallel, about 170 miles north of the demilitarized zone, it has stepped up the number of raids and increased the tonnage dropped to over 20 million pounds of explosives in the month of April. For example, on one recent day, U.S. planes flew 145 sorties over the southern panhandle above the DMZ through which North Vietnam has been funneling supplies and troops. Even so, by our own reports, troops and ammunition are being moved into South Vietnam at a steady pace, proving yet again the ineffectiveness of the most widespread bombing in halting infiltration of men and supplies.

According to the American military, the North is staging a huge build-up in the South in preparation for a second great offensive, probably in May or June, similar to the one at Tet that so rattled Allied forces. To hamper their preparations, joint U.S. and Saigon forces are currently conducting large-scale search and destroy missions around Saigon, in the Mekong Delta, near Khesanh and between Hue and the DMZ. The one in the Saigon area is called "Operation Complete Victory," which is hardly likely to induce a psychological climate favorable to serious discussions about peace.

Both sides evidently believe that proved battle readiness will strengthen their positions during negotiations. It is certainly in keeping with Hanoi's policy, revealed in captured documents, of fighting while negotiating. Many Americans, remembering our experience in Korea, dislike the prospect and therefore oppose any negotiations. Nevertheless, contrary to repeated statements that American casualties were greater during the two years of Korean truce talks than in the year of fighting before, American battle deaths and wounded were reduced by two-thirds during the negotiations. In that war, peace talks, however frustrating, served to restrain the carnage. There is no guarantee, of course, that this pattern will be repeated in Vietnam, but it seems worth the risk, not only to reduce American casualties, but to spare the chief victims of the war—Vietnamese civilians.

All of this assumes that substantive peace talks will get under way during the months remaining to the Johnson Administration. The present outlook is not cheerful and much of the good will generated by President Johnson's and Hanoi's initial moves in early April has undoubtedly been dissipated. Still, it may not be too late to salvage the situation. Some observers contend that Paris, which U Thant is promoting, would be acceptable; others say that Warsaw should not be ruled out either. Arrangements could be made to allow attendance by South Vietnam and South Korea, which have no diplomatic relations with Poland, should the U.S. and North Vietnam agree to hold talks there.

The main obstacle to the start of peace talks, however, seems to be the hawks in the Johnson Administration who cling to the pipe dream that a total military victory in Vietnam is possible. Having led us through the political folly and moral debasement of military overkill, they now threaten to scuttle negotiations. Their leading spokesmen seem more intent on vindicating past policies than in taking the necessary steps to bringing the war to an end. Perhaps now would be a good time to heed Sen. McCarthy's repeated suggestion that the chief proponents of those discredited policies, namely Rusk and Rostow, be retired as an earnest of America's search for peace.

KY'S ABOUT-FACE

If it is true that many Vietnamese are waiting to see who's going to win the war before they choose up sides, it is also true, possibly, of the Saigon government itself. In a remarkable interview with Oriana Fallaci of the Italian weekly *L'Europeo*, Vice President Ky reveals a man trying to secure a place for himself in the coalition government to come. In a spring of surprises, the Ky interview must rank with the Johnson retirement announcement in terms of its possible impact—at least on those who were prepared to see the General as the last bulwark for the American cause in Vietnam. Here are some of his remarks:

"Not all the evil is on the Communist side. The corruption is among us, among our leaders. Nine out of ten are corrupted. . . . Politicians don't like me because I am not a politician, because I am not a diplomat, because I denounce this regime as an inefficient one, an incapable one, and because I say that democracy exists in it only as a name. Americans don't like me because I tell them what I think, and I accuse them of lying. Americans claim to be here in name of their principles of democracy and freedom. I do not believe them; at the best, I believe them 50 percent.

"Americans are here because they want to stay in Asia, to fight communism in Asia, not because they care for us . . . It is always these big powerful countries which create colonialism. They begin with saying: 'We are here to help you.' And then they become bosses, and then they become colonialists. Enough with that."

The Marshal Ky who spoke of Hitler as his hero, speaks of himself as a social revolutionary in this interview, and takes steps to minimize his differences with Ho Chi Minh and even the National Liberation Front itself. He asks: "Americans want to institute in South Vietnam a kind of democratic regime they have in mind; respect for the laws, freedom of speech and so on. Elections. But what does it mean to speak of elections to someone who dies

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of starvation? What does it mean to talk about legislative power, executive power, when all that you need is a bowl of rice for your children?"

After having invested so much prestige in the vaunted 1966 elections, the Americans in Saigon and Washington will be pleased to learn from the South Vietnamese Vice President that "in most of the cases, the men who have been elected in South Vietnam are not the men that people want; they do not represent the people. The people voted for them because someone told them to vote. Our elections were a loss of time and money, a mockery. They were only useful to elect a regime which is wrong and corrupted and weak and would fall immediately with a revolution. It is hard for me to say so because I share the responsibility of those elections. I was elected in them and I am the Vice President of such a regime. But at least I recognize the evil where the evil is and I say that laws must be changed, because what we now have are laws that defend the rich. We need new laws to defend the poor."

The interviewer jokingly asks him whether or not he knows that he is speaking socialism. "Who denies it?" Ky replies with *sang froid*. "I am not afraid of the word 'socialism.' It is the Americans who pronounce the word 'socialism' as if it were a dirty word." He says that he does have differences with the D.R.V., but his phrasing would not send legions of volunteers pouring north across the 17th Parallel. He doesn't like the Communists because they "resemble the Catholics so much. They belong to the party exactly as the Catholics belong to the Church." It appears that he is merely against "fanatics." Moreover, it is only fate that has placed him "on this side of the barricades." "If my destiny had been different, I could have been on [Ho's] side." Only then he would have been "impotent, and I could not dream *my* revolution" (our emphasis).

"I know very well that the Communists and I have many dreams in common, common targets, common aims. I know very well that the system on this side of the barricades is wrong, but it wouldn't make any sense to abandon a wrong system for a wrong system."

Ky goes on to ruminate about what he would have done in the Tet offensive—he would have taken Tansonnhut airport rather than have a go at the American Embassy—and makes several more kindly remarks about the peasants and the "mass" who stay neither with Ho nor the good general, but "only with its bowl of rice." Forgetting Hitler, he expresses his admiration for Churchill, De Gaulle and Stalin and his distaste for white civilians as well as the three superpowers for whom Vietnam is merely a pawn in their game. "We are the pretext for their vanity," Ky declaims, "which only looks at the conquest of the power, of the supremacy. And in such a struggle, we risk being quashed without pity."

Now the question is whether or not the United States can demonstrate the same flexibility as its own putative puppet.

German Students Rock The Establishment

The shooting of radical student leader Rudi Dutschke by a professed admirer of Hitler has sparked violent protest demonstrations not only throughout West Germany, but also in Rome, London, Washington and New York.

When I met "Red Rudi" in West Berlin several weeks before the attempt on his life, I discovered young Americans among his followers. Dutschke's wife is an American. Students for a Democratic Society—which organized the protest in New York—has sent delegates to meetings of Dutschke's *Sozialistische Deutsche Studentenbund*; the two SDS's have enjoyed a steadily growing working relationship. Indeed, the young German radicals say they were originally inspired by the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley.

Ironically, students in Prague—rebelling against a regime with a totally opposite ideology—told me their revolt was partly inspired by the West German New Left. More recently, Polish students have taken the cue from the success of their counterparts in Czechoslovakia. The "good news" from Berkeley has spread fast and far.

Rudi Dutschke is a lithe, dark, intense-looking young man. His sharp gestures, his emphatic manner of speaking, and even the way his hair hangs over his forehead reminds one of Hitler. With a grin, Rudi once told me he had been called a "left fascist." Anyone watching him harangue an audience might well agree. Yet Herr Dutschke (who usually wears a striped shirt and blue jeans) has a sense of humor and a bohemiam gusto far closer to the style of American SDS than to German authoritarianism.

Many observers believe it is because German SDS is *not* nationalistic that it offers hopeful alternatives to the present system. Dutschke's followers (the most radical among the leftists) pointed out that their ideas have come from American philosophers, Polish revisionists, and the writings of Mao Tse Tung. Techniques have emerged from the direct action of Dutch Provos and English peace-marchers. SDS ranks have included Chileans, Cubans, Frenchmen and Scandinavians. Issues range from the German government's participation in NATO to "genocide in Vietnam," the *coup d'état* in Greece, and the kidnapping of Koreans. There has been no trace of the racism that has scarred the German past.

Dutschke's program is no less than an overthrow of the whole "system." Like the students at Berkeley, German activists began by rebelling against the "lack of democracy" in the mass universities—and then came to feel that this was only a reflection of the ills in society at large. They began to protest against the "emergency

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laws," which can give the Bonn government quasi-dictatorial powers; the presence of former Nazis in high posts; and the coalition of Social Democrats and Christian Democrats which virtually eliminates effective opposition. Moreover, Dutschke pointed out, talk of re-unifying Germany has become "sheer hypocrisy"; politicians are simply using the issue and a virulent, outdated anti-Communism for their own ends. Radicals have become more aware of "the sickness of all Western imperialism," and have identified with all the peoples of the "oppressed Third World."

When the student Benno Ohnesorg was killed last summer during a demonstration against the Shah of Iran, and the accused policeman freed because the court claimed it could not ascertain how his gun had gone off, the rebels saw this as proof of the conspiracy of the "system." Thus, the present campaign to block distribution of newspapers controlled by Axel Springer (who publishes 40 percent of the West German dailies, and is bitterly critical of the students) is no capricious search for a scapegoat. The radicals see him as a symbol of authoritarianism, hypocrisy, and manipulation by the mass media.

If this sounds familiar, it is no accident. In the words of Bob Gottlieb, an American SDS member who visited Berlin last fall, "The Springer thing pinpoints it—like the campaign against Dow napalm here. In German SDS we found the same political attitudes—the same style and spirit. We're children of similar middle-class, affluent societies, we're alienated for basically the same reasons, and we're working out similar strategies and utopias."

The utopia Rudi Dutschke and his followers envision is not a conventional "democratic alternative." Scorning parliamentarism, they want what they call "*true* democracy"—direct participatory socialism. While a few SDS members follow the Soviet pattern, and others consider themselves Maoist, the majority find themselves closer to Dutschke's synthetic approach. He believes in "permanent revolution" and the workers' councils of China, but looks more to Cuba for his model of socialism in practice. His heroes are Che Guevara and the German-American neo-Marxist philosopher Herbert Marcuse. In the words of Jacob Taubes, an American teaching at Berlin's Free University: "These students have made a total break with the value-system of the West."

German SDS leaders see the students as the only true revolutionary class today, and their task as radicalizing other sectors of society. Although they recognize that workers in postwar Germany have become "burgherized," leaders hope to radicalize the student class, then the technical workers, and next the unskilled unemployed. Thus, their strategy is close to that of American SDS, which is trying to create a partnership with the unemployed blacks.

There are, however, many differences between the two SDS groups. Dutschke's wife, a theology student, observed regretfully that "when you talk about a 'love component in the human community,' the kids here think it's corny." Nor has German SDS expressed a clear preference for non-violent methods. "*We* have not used violent methods," Dutschke said, adding, "but *they*—the police —regard non-violent protests as terroristic. It is our duty to see that no man is killed. But we should never hold back because we fear bloodshed!"

There can be little doubt that the extremists have provoked violent reactions by mocking the police, shouting threats and breaking up meetings. Many seem to be more intent on alienating than reaching the populace. Nevertheless, the fact remains that it was the police who initiated the violence in suppressing the protests that followed the shooting of Dutschke. Moreover, the students have gained not only some twenty-fifth hour support from government leaders, but even some public sympathy. How they will fare in the month of May—when further demonstrations are planned—is another question. Considering that the young radicals see themselves in "continuous revolt" for a "permanent revolution," the bloodshed may have only begun. MARJORIE HOPE

(Marjorie Hope is a journalist who has written about revolutionary movements in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe. She recently returned from Germany.)

Senator Lausche Underdogs It Again

Sen. Frank J. Lausche of Ohio is making his underdog way back to a third term with hardly a yelp. In this he has the indispensable assistance of the state Democratic party and the Ohio AFL-CIO. Both endorsed Lausche's opponent, John J. Gilligan, in the May 7 primary. In Ohio, where neither Democratic nor labor organizations have their fair share of brainpower, that helps Lausche.

Gilligan himself, a liberal ex-Congressman from Cincinnati, is a mite too bright for Ohio politics. A decorated World War II veteran, he has doubts about the war in Vietnam which contrast sharply with his bloodthirsty labor support but line up well with President Johnson's peace effort. Gilligan is readying a media campaign on TV splendidly suited to Lausche's talents for battling a malefactor of great wealth, especially labor wealth. This type of campaign also seems to require a plush Columbus office suite where champagne is served and full-time staffers think deeply. Whatever it does for gracious living, it is certainly a strange way to try to beat Lausche.

All Lausche needs is indignation, preferably speechless. He doesn't need tears for the boys in Vietnam, Ohio's trees, bossism, his bouts with the gamblers, truckers and strip-miners, the me-and-FDR speech, the strong-man-weeping-for-the-country act, and wowing the sows at the county fairs. The normal Lausche electioneering impedimenta are superfluous now. The Gilligan life style will do

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it alone. A landslide, as Democratic primaries go in Ohio, is in the making for May 7.

After that, all Lausche needs do is beat Attorney General William B. Saxbe, a congenial Republican put up by Lausche's congenial Republican friends, who include Gov. James A. Rhodes. Rhodes and Saxbe consider Lausche a Republican at heart. In this they are somewhat mistaken. Under the thin film of reason and *gemütlichkeit*, Lausche is at heart a hard-core, right-wing extremist.

The man who cries about bossism started out as the Democratic boss of the 23rd Ward in Cleveland. He became first a judge, then mayor, through the good offices of Democratic Boss Ray Miller. Lausche subsequently dumped Miller and set up a city machine which ran Cleveland downhill for 27 years. His machine established city hall bureaucrats so lazy and inept that their very salaries were petty graft. These sums over 27 years, however, amounted to about $1.2 billion. Lausche supported these timeservers, and they him, down to Mayor Ralph S. Locher's last gasp in 1967. When Carl B. Stokes became the Democratic nominee in the primary which overthrew the Lausche machine at last, Boss Lausche naturally refused to support him. And Lausche is still boss. Locher turned up at a Slovenian dinner for Lausche last month. Slovenians—yes! Negroes—no! That's Boss Lausche's Cleveland.

A four-term governor of Ohio (1946-48, 1950-56), Lausche dealt comfortably with Republicans, particularly the Joe McCarthy type during the Senator's era. He and they dragged Ohio to the bottom of the list of major states in education, universities, industry, welfare, recreation, parks, public safety, roads and *per capita* taxes, the last being the nominal objective. For state officeholders, Lausche's Ohio became like Lausche's Cleveland—all pay, no work, and another $3 billion in unearned salaries over the eight awful years. Patting cows at state fairs and talking about trees, Lausche sold his program of fake economy, glossed with phony FDR liberalism when absolutely necessary, to small-town, rural and city hicks. There were enough of them to elect Lausche Senator in 1956, and again in 1962.

Having tried to make Ohio over in the poor Southern state mold, Lausche in Washington actually thinks he is a Dixiecrat, except during elections, and votes with the worst of them. With fine flourishes of florid, right-wing extremist rhetoric, Lausche voted against the poverty programs, aid to cities, the domestic Peace Corps, organized labor, economic assistance abroad, and aid to education at all levels and for all people. In 1964, Lausche said of the domestic Peace Corps, "The strong arm of the federal government, composed of 5,000 agents, would be stretched into the different States, admittedly to tell them what they should do with regard to the management of their government."

Lausche is for the war in Vietnam, military assistance abroad in support of dictators, encouragement of the "right to work" statutes through federal legislation, and reversal of the Supreme Court's one-man-one-vote rule.

True, Lausche has long opposed gamblers, trucking interests and strip-mining abuses, but who knows the real results of these battles? Lausche, unlike Sen. Stephen Young of Ohio, never opens his books to the people of Ohio. Only his psychic pay from the chambers of commerce and manufacturers' associations, the American Farm Bureau, Young Americans for Freedom, and the John Birch Society is visible.

The Lausche ambiguities grow in inverse proportion to the time before elections. Thus, the real Lausche voted against cloture on the civil rights housing bill. Then as elections drew near, he voted for cloture. This is par for the Lausche pre-election course. During the past six months, honest Frank has also been working toward a suitably ambiguous Vietnam record. In the end, hundreds of thousands of Ohioans will come to believe that a vote for Lausche is a vote for peace. They will deduce this from one of Lausche's famous acts. He will, just once, burst into public tears over Vietnam. JOHN BARDEN

(John Barden is a member of the faculty of Case-Western Reserve University.)

● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●

THE DEMOCRATIC MIX

BACK HOME IN INDIANA

During a campaign stop at the Oshkosh Airport, a few days before the Wisconsin primary, an advisor took Eugene McCarthy aside to tell him Robert Kennedy had just officially entered the Indiana primary. McCarthy nodded, paused, and then said, "If Bobby's going down there, I suppose we'll have to, but only one or two trips." Oshkosh must be a bad place to plan tactics, because one or two trips won't be enough for the Minnesota senator. After Lyndon Johnson's withdrawal and McCarthy's Wisconsin victory, the stakes of the May 7 vote are a lot higher. For McCarthy and Kennedy will collide at the polls for the first time.

The third man on Indiana's Democratic primary ballot is Governor Roger Branigan, running as a favorite son. He was a corporation lawyer before riding into office on the 1964 Johnson landslide. He is part of the conservative wing of the state party, run by two long-time Indiana power brokers, Frank McHale and Frank McKinney.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This faction is backed by the business and finance interests of the state. It corresponds to a similar wing of the state Republican party, once led by former Senators William Jenner and Homer Capehart, and also supported by the banks and railroads. Although the bipartisan grip business once held on Indiana politics has weakened, the corporations can still fill Branigan's campaign chest.

The governor also counts on the support of the solid state party organization. Indiana parties still run on patronage—the statehouse controls 23,000 jobs and the county courthouses give out thousands of others. The patronage clout should help the county leaders deliver their rank-and-file, something the chairman of the fluid Wisconsin party couldn't do. And because their own party posts are at stake in the primary, the county and precinct leaders should be working to turn out Branigan regulars. Most of the county chairmen have declared for the governor, although several have claimed neutrality.

Branigan has other sources of strength. Both of the United States senators, Vance Hartke and Birch Bayh, must rely on the party organization. Consequently, they must wait until after the primary before they endorse Kennedy. The White House wants Branigan to win and is lending support through the Democratic National Committee. And Branigan is known as a strong, though reluctant, campaigner. He's witty, gracious, knows how to handle a crowd. He plans to go into 85 of the state's 92 counties and use heavy TV promotion to support these personal appearances.

Nevertheless, the Kennedy and McCarthy organizations think the governor can be hurt. He's a lame duck and leaves office at the end of the year. This could diminish the patronage threat. Also, the fight to succeed Branigan is splitting the Democrats. The governor backs a state representative, Richard Bodine of South Bend, but Lieutenant Governor Robert Rock also wants the job, and he has a good party following. Rock's friends would like to hurt Bodine by embarrassing Branigan. Branigan is resented by many regulars who doubt his loyalty to the full party. The governor gave several key state jobs to Republicans put forth by the state Chamber of Commerce. His day-to-day party work bores him and he's made Democratic enemies simply through neglect. For instance, after a freak explosion killed dozens of customers at a Richmond store a few weeks ago, the governor failed even to telephone the town's Democratic mayor or offer emergency aid. Richmond's Democrats will vote against Branigan.

Even if Branigan does win the first ballot votes of the state's 63 convention delegates, he'll still lose them to Kennedy on the second ballot. The state party chairman, Gordon St. Angelo, controls the delegate slate, despite its pledge to the governor. St. Angelo favors the New York senator, although at this point his job still depends on Branigan and he must back the outgoing executive. If McCarthy takes the delegates and cannot win on the first convention ballot, then St. Angelo could hurt him.

This type of maneuvering shows what seems so far to be McCarthy's worst weakness—and, some would say, his greatest strength. The New Politics practiced by Eugene McCarthy focuses on the intellectual merit of policy stands. It creates and develops issues as though they concern all Americans equally. This style of politics seems to ignore, or at least avoid, the national diversity of social, class, racial, economic and ethnic interests. It works well among the voters of states like Wisconsin and Minnesota. Except for a small Negro population, the people of both these states are homogeneous. The cleavages are trifling: German Lutheran versus German Catholic, or Swedish Lutheran versus Norwegian Lutheran. And McCarthy's New Politics also appeals to liberals and intellectuals, of course. His Indiana support centers on members of the ADA and ACLU, the college people, and old Stevensonians like Ralph Fasig of Indianapolis.

Robert Kennedy's New Politics seems to take this approach, too. But it also pays attention to the special interests McCarthy refuses to seek out singly. Kennedy makes a particular appeal to the groups that have been kept outside the electorate for years: Indians, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Negroes, poor whites. This gives his campaign a left-liberal quality, because much of it is geared to the needs of these groups for stronger social welfare programs. Despite the progressive substance of this appeal, the tactic itself is Old Politics—it would be understood by the voters of a state like Massachusetts. Or, perhaps, Indiana.

But right now, some McCarthy volunteers joke, their man already holds a voting lead. During spring vacation, hundreds of college students came home and filed absentee ballots for McCarthy. Many of the same students are back home now, ringing doorbells and trying to make sure their candidate holds his advantage.

RALPH WHITEHEAD JR.

(Ralph Whitehead Jr., a former newspaper reporter, now writes for The New Republic *and other journals.)*

NEXT WEEK

Dachine Rainer writes in the spring book issue of Rebecca West:

"H. G. Wells, probably the most intelligent and imaginative writer, and Shaw, certainly the most dazzling stylist of the period, were her mentors. She excelled Wells often in style, for which she must be at least somewhat indebted to an appreciation of Shaw. . . . Indeed, she excelled Shaw as a political thinker; she was subtler and more logical. That—without discrediting her native endowment—one may attribute in part to her close association with Wells."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARTIN LUTHER KING —UNSUNG THEOLOGIAN

He developed the theology of reconciliation into a new method for effecting change

HERBERT WARREN RICHARDSON

Martin Luther King was the most important theologian of our time not because of the plenitude of his literary production, but because of his creative proposals for dealing with the structure of evil generated by modern relativism, viz., ideological conflict. Over against this understanding of social evil, King created not only a new theology, but also new types of piety, new styles of Christian living.

Relativism is like gnosticism in that it affirms knowledge to be acquired only in a privileged way; but relativism is like scientific naturalism in that it claims the object of knowledge to be natural. The peculiar demonic tendency of relativism arises from the combination of these two factors. With respect to the fact that it affirms access to knowledge to be privileged and not public, relativism posits the same irrevocable and irreconcilable separation of the *cognoscenti* from outsiders that is found in gnosticism. But whereas the gnostic object of knowledge is supernatural, the relativistic object of knowledge is natural. Whereas gnosticism asserts an opposition between the natural and supernatural orders of reality, relativism asserts an opposition within a single natural order between those who truly understand the meaning of life and those who do not. In this way, modern relativism generates a unique institution: ritual ideological conflict. This conflict is undertaken both because of and in order to confirm ideological commitments. It is not, in fact, conflict over particular problems; hence it is unresolvable in principle.

Modern relativism brings the dualism that is characteristic of religious gnosticism down into the natural order of time and space. In this situation there is inevitably conflict, for there is no basis for peaceful coexistence among parties that are ideologically opposed. Faced with the inevitability of ideological conflict, the relativists have replied that conflict, even war, is not only a necessary but also a valuable part of life. They say that it creates values rather than destroying them. Conflict not only encourages pluralism and diversity; it even creates or strengthens such values as justice, brotherhood and equality.

Relativism so pervades the world today that conflict, even violent conflict, is glorified not only by the extreme right and the extreme left; it has been increasingly structured into the whole fabric of modern culture. Faced with this demonic tendency, the Church must oppose relativism with a faith which will open it to a transcending redemptive reality.

Now, if we seek a conception of faith which is appropriately correlated with relativism, we shall understand faith as the power of reconciliation which works to unite the many relative perspectives and to thwart ideological conflict. In this context, faith is the commitment of man to oppose the separation of man from man. It is a commitment to struggle against attacks on the common good, against racism and segregation, and against the fragmentation of man's intellectual and spiritual life.

The most important proponent of a theology of reconciliation was Martin Luther King, who developed this theological principle into a new method for effecting social change. In his theology, therefore, faith affirms reconciliation in opposition to the relativism that denies its possibility. In intellectual discussion, faith hopes for agreement and not only dialogue. In war, faith expects and works for peace. In economic struggle, it calls for the common good. In the working together of churches, it anticipates ecumenical reunion. In all these acts, faith

HERBERT WARREN RICHARDSON *is assistant professor of theology at Harvard University Divinity School.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

affirms something relativism cannot see, i.e., the power of divine unity working in all things to reconcile the ideological conflict generated by relativism itself. Quite concretely, too, faith as the affirmation of such a power of reconciliation also affirms that all those institutions and movements of our time which are working to overcome ideological conflicts are special instruments of redemptive power. One thinks immediately of King's support of the United Nations, of his development of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and of his concern for peace and ecumenism. These are the institutions where God is working in the world today. But only the eyes of faith can see it.

The struggle against ideological conflict anywhere in the world is the struggle for the unity of men living together in the world. Conversely, because the struggle against racism is really a struggle against ideological conflict, Martin Luther King recognized that he had to oppose this kind of conflict wherever it appears. He was, so to say, under this obligation *in principle*. Hence, King was the first of those who linked the civil rights struggle to opposition to the Vietnam war.

Civil Rights and Vietnam

It is instructive now to recall that many active supporters of King's civil rights program opposed his opposition to the Vietnam war. King, they said, was mixing up the civil rights movement with the problem of the war and this would weaken the struggle for integration. But these critics supposed that these were, in fact, two different problems rather than two manifestations of the same structure of evil: ideological conflict. By the very fact that King refused to separate these two issues, he showed the profundity of his theological insight into the nature of evil today. And who, today, would deny that what he first affirmed as a lone prophetic voice has now come to pass and been acknowledged by all among us as a basic social fact? Racial discrimination is but one form of the peculiar form of evil which characterizes our time—the presence of ideological hate within the world denies the possibility in principle of the unity of man with man.

King's perception of the human problem today as rooted in a certain structure of social evil led him to emphasize again and again that his struggle was directed against the forces, or structure, of evil itself rather than against the person or group who is doing the evil. Christian faith sees neither particular men nor particular groups as evil, but sees them trapped within a structure of ideological separation which makes ritual conflict inevitable. In order to overcome this kind of evil, faith does not attack the men who do evil, but the structure of evil which makes men act violently. Hence, there must be an *asymmetry* between the form in which evil manifests itself and the form of our opposition to evil. We should meet violence with non-violence. The philosophy of "black power" assumes that there must be a symmetry between the form in which evil manifests itself and the form of our opposition to it. But King saw that such a symmetrical response only perpetuates the structure of evil itself. In describing his work in the Montgomery bus boycott, King said:

"In my weekly remarks as president, I stressed that the use of violence in our struggle would be both impractical and immoral. To meet hate with retaliatory hate would do nothing but intensify the existence of evil in the universe. Hate begets hate; violence begets violence; toughness begets a greater toughness. We must meet the forces of hate with the power of love; we must meet physical force with soul force. Our aim must never be to defeat or humiliate the white man, but to win his friendship and understanding."

In this statement, the asymmetrical character of the struggle against evil is clearly noted and, as we have seen, the affirmation of the possibility of this asymmetry grows out of the vision that grounded King's theology. Face to face with the white man, bound, so to say, to the realm of relativism, to the order of visible differences and diverse histories, one can find no grounds for agreement, unity, or friendship. In such a realm, there are, as one theologian even today affirms, "only individuals and fights." But the vision of faith is that there is an invisible unity that makes the white and black man one in love, in holy communion, in common goal and good. But this realm of unity is seen only by faith, and the one who responds to evil asymmetrically, returning good for evil, is the man who lives by faith.

It should be noted that King did not argue for non-violence on a fideistic or confessional ground—as if hereby we are making an eschatological witness to the Lordship of Christ, a witness that must, in our time, always be defeated. King argues that non-violence is the sole *practical* way to struggle against evil because it alone is based on a right understanding of reality itself. To struggle against evil within the system of ideological conflict never solves anything, but simply perpetuates the problem by confirming the structure of evil itself. This is why so much concerned social action is counter-effective—because one ideology lives off its opposition to another and thereby strengthens that which it opposes in the very act of opposing it. King's profound understanding of the way in which structures of evil in the world drive men to act evilly, i.e., oppress men until they are sick and filled with hatred and fear for all "outsiders," is what gave his theology a critical focus that is duplicated nowhere else on the contemporary scene.

Not only was King's understanding of the character of evil in the modern world precise and relevant, but so too was his vision of the goal of the struggle against evil and his understanding of the relation of the two. King identified the goal of the struggle against evil as the total interrelatedness of man with man, an ability to live to-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gether with those who are different, even opposed. We should not seek "to defeat or humiliate our opponent, but to win his friendship and understanding." Note King's stress on friendship as the ultimate value of human life. Protestant theology has so neglected the development of an adequate value theory or the idea of a chief good of life that we can scarcely understand why King holds that friendship is this good, why it is the purpose of all that we do. Protestants have, moreover, twisted the concept of Christian love to the requirements of the doctrine of justification by faith, i.e., to the demands of Reformation dogma, affirming that Christian love is self-sacrificing agape—not personal communion. To describe Christian love as self-sacrificing agape is to put the cart before the horse. According to King, self-sacrificing love grows naturally out of the love of friendship, out of the sense of being in communion with the one to whom good is returned for evil. Self-sacrifice cannot *establish* personal friendship, it can only manifest it. If it does not manifest it, then this love is only a more insidious form of evil, "the heaping of coals."

Emphasis on Christian love as friendship involves an important reversal of a pervasive Reformation error. Such a reversal could come, I surmise, only from a perspective that was itself not wholly at ease with the magisterial reformation, i.e., only from the "third wing," the spiritualists, the Baptists. One can understand today why Harvey Cox should say that the life and work of King make him proud to be a Baptist. And we should not forget this: that King's spiritualistic concern for the sanctification of the world and his vision of Christian love as friendship give his theological ethics a specificity that contrasts markedly with the other contemporary options.

We can understand the significance of King's insistence upon the unity of persons in friendship (brotherhood) as the goal of all life by contrasting it with an ethics that regards self-sacrificing agape (or the "faith" that receives it) as the chief good of human life. Such an ethics must regard evil as a necessary (even good) condition of human life. For in order for self-sacrifice to be possible, there must be an evil to be suffered. Self-sacrifice is good, therefore, not in itself, but because it deters or limits evil. In this framework, the fundamental fact of life is seen to be the ineradicability of evil—and by elevating self-sacrificial agape into the principal ethic, we know not the "essential good" but only the "deterrent good." In our own time, Reinhold Niebuhr reintroduced this Reformation, though semi-Manichean, understanding of evil back into American theology—and King's writings show a constant wrestling against him and the problem he raises. King's reply, his decisive repudiation of the Niebuhrian scheme, comes in his different, but more profound, understanding of evil as the structure that engenders ideological conflict, a structure that is to be opposed not by settling for proximate justice in the political order, and acknowledging the legitimacy of violent force to restrain evil, but by striving for a holy community of love in this world by the nonviolent striving to overcome evil with good.

King was regarded as a civil rights leader and as a man of extraordinary personal valor, but he has not been understood as a brilliant and mature theologian: the first two would, however, have been impossible without the third. It would be a tragedy, I believe, if we were to remember him only as hero and not as thinker—by still giving our minds over to the authors of ponderous tomes and the orators on prestigious lecture platforms while giving over only our hearts to him. He deserves our head as well as our heart. He is the theologian for our time.

Victory is no solution

COEXISTENCE IN NIGERIA

JOHN HORGAN

As the Biafran resistance crumbles under the weight of Nigerian armor—and assuming that negotiations will take place after, and not before, a complete military victory by the federal forces—people are looking forward with no little apprehension to a peace that may well be as dangerous as the war. Nigerian unity has never been a solid, popularly-based phenomenon: after the war, it will be facing one of the severest tests in its short and chaotic history.

The difficulties have partly to do with the people of the Eastern region, partly with the stresses and strains affecting the federal military government. All these are factors which make an early return to civilian rule (the original timetable envisaged this by early 1969) virtually out of the question.

Victory will not solve the problem of Biafra. For ten months, now, some twelve to fourteen million Easterners, most of them members of the Ibo tribal

JOHN HORGAN, *a staff writer at the* Irish Times, *Dublin, and a commentator on Telefis Eireann, has just returned from a visit to Biafra and Nigeria.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation, have fought, often desperately, for the right to a separate existence. They opposed a federal government which, virtually since the beginning of the war, allowed its forces to be used in a particularly unscrupulous way. When a B.B.C. reporter asked one federal officer whether there were any Ibos left in a town he had just captured, he was told brusquely that if there were, "they had better not be alive"; his attitude seemed to sum up Nigerian military policy.

Civilian Atrocities

Biafran casualties have been small by comparison with those of, say, Vietnam, but the misery has been no less real, the extermination no less deliberate and probably even more so. In Asaba, just across the Niger from the Biafran town of Onitsha, some 700 Ibos were shot after the men had been lined up against one side of the main street and the women and children on the other. Nigerian authorities later claimed that this had been the result of "a mistake." Early in April, Onitsha itself, once the largest market town in West Africa and known as the jewel of the Niger, fell to federal troops. The city, under siege for months, is now a scorched and nearly empty ruin; fewer than 800 of the former population of 160,000 remain, without water or electricity and dependent upon their conquerors for food. Two hours after the town of Igwada had been taken, a Roman Catholic missionary saw the streets littered with civilian corpses. The Nigerian bombers, although they sometimes attacked strategic targets like the oil refinery, cement factories and palm oil tanks, usually showed a distinct preference for launching anti-personnel bombs into marketplaces and crowded urban centers, returning later to strafe the survivors. Hospitals suffered too; finally, even a regrettably lethargic International Red Cross was moved to protest: the Biafrans themselves have submitted a detailed account of their civilian casualties, and a strong protest, to the United Nations.

Biafran motives for seceding were, in the beginning, admittedly mixed—confusion about oil royalties, fear that the 1966 massacres of Ibos would be repeated, and so on—but relatively early on in the war independence became a reality for them. This was especially true after they discovered that they were not going to be crushed like flies; and whatever else the war has left behind it, it has left several million people who have tasted nationhood, however brutally truncated; they will remember what it is like. Politics is largely powerless against human experience of this order, and even though there may be peace, it will be an uncertain one, riddled with doubts, sabotage and an unwillingness to cooperate. Broadly speaking, the Biafrans gradually became convinced that independence and independence alone would guarantee their individual and corporate safety alongside, rather than as part of, a state which has in the past shown precious little respect for either. Their determination in this has been as evident as their sad bewilderment at the total unconcern which the rest of the world—with the exception of the Vatican and the World Council of Churches—has shown toward their aspirations. In recent weeks, the federal government, sensing victory, has shown fierce resentment toward these two world religious bodies because they have called for a cease fire and a negotiated settlement of the war. Foreign missionaries, too, chiefly Catholic, Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian and Baptist, have come under attack because of their support and defense of the Biafran cause. In retaliation, Nigeria has blocked the movement of missionaries and relief supplies into Biafra and has introduced monthly security checks on the whereabouts and activities of all foreign mission personnel.

The situation has become further complicated by Tanzania's diplomatic recognition of Biafra. Although it probably has come too late to help the Biafrans, Tanzania's move infuriated Nigeria which looked upon it as an unwarranted foreign intrusion into a domestic problem. Nigeria also feared that other African nations might follow Tanzania's diplomatic example, or worse, supply concrete aid. (On a recent visit to West African capitals, Tanzania's President Julius K. Nyerere reportedly tried to solicit such aid for Biafra.) Therefore, Nigeria has stepped up its military pressure, anxious to finish the war quickly and ward off any more international support for Biafra, whether in Africa or beyond.

There seems to be little coherent thought in Lagos, the capital of Nigeria, about what is going to happen to Easterners in general and Ibos in particular, assuming the war is over soon. Take the question of enrollment in the Army, for instance. Some Lagos officials insist on the need for a "phasing in" of Ibos to the armed forces, and are unwilling to allow them any influence in it in the immediate future. Others suggest that there is no obstacle to the creation of an Eastern battalion or two, which would be kept more or less permanently in the Eastern Region (to be divided into three states) and, presumably, not oversupplied with arms. Where civilians are concerned there is an even greater spread of opinion. One senior federal official has suggested that the root of the problem is an economic one—the fact that so many Ibos were forced to seek their bread and butter outside their homeland—and suggests that what is needed is a strategy to keep them in the East. This could be done, he argues, by discriminating economically in favor of the Ibos after the war so that they will simply not need to leave home in order to enjoy an adequate standard of living.

The slightly chilling overtones of such a scheme—by which it is proposed to reduce the number of Ibos in other parts of the country to a maximum of around 100,000, instead of their customary two million or so—are heightened by serious doubts about its practicality, let alone its justice. Reconstruction after the war will in any

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

case be a massive, nationwide problem: Nigerians who have spent the best part of a year shooting at, and being shot at by, the Ibos, will not take kindly to an economic policy which gives their enemies massive priority. More than that, there is evidence that proponents of a scheme like this represent moderate opinion. It will need considerable restraining power by the idealistic General Gowon if his generals are not to embark on a policy with distressing resemblances to the original "final solution." It is precisely genocide that Biafrans fear most.

General Gowon is, luckily, more in control now than at any time since he was put into power by the Army in July 1966. At that time the country was virtually in a state of anarchy, and it was all that he could do to keep the Army itself in harness. Nevertheless, his relationships with his senior commanders are not all sweetness and light—notably where Colonel Mohammed, one of the leaders of the 1966 coup, is concerned. The end of the war will be the signal for the inauguration of a complicated power game for effective control of the Army. At the moment, each of the three main divisions in the field is not only empowered to do its own recruiting and arrange for its own supplies, but is to a large extent independent even of headquarters. Each is commanded by a tough, independently-minded, officer who will not take kindly to any immediate diminution of power and influence.

There are already signs that the problem is not confined to the senior levels of the Army. Reports about "thugs in Army uniform" are filtering into the papers, providing evidence that there is a certain amount of trouble from deserters, many of them armed, who have taken to bank robbery and intimidation in an attempt to live off the land. There are also disturbing reports that, in addition to the massive amount of arms already in use on the various fronts, unused weapons are also being stockpiled in various parts of the country. Russian arms, in particular, are said to have been cached in the North. After the Mid-West was retaken by the government, on the other hand, a large quantity of captured Biafran arms (and misappropriated federal arms) is said to have found its way back to Lagos. Any future internecine disturbance, it is clear, will not be easy to control.

Power at the Center

There is some evidence for the belief that the creation of twelve new states to take the place of the former four regions in Nigeria's federal structure may have a stabilizing influence. Certainly the influence of the Northern Peoples' Congress, one of the *bêtes noires* of traditional Nigerian politics, has been severely circumscribed by the subdivision of the North, and the party itself is split because some of its members have found employment in the new states' administrations, while others have not. But nobody likes to lose an empire, and the N.P.C. will be slow to abandon the field.

All the indications at the moment are that the twelve states do not represent the limit of constitutional development: the Yorubas in the former Western Region, for one thing, are showing fissiparous tendencies, and the huge North Eastern state may also be divided in the interests of the Kanuri tribesmen who inhabit one portion of it. The multiplicity of states, and the fact that many of them will be dangerously short of human and material resources, will tend to concentrate an increasing amount of financial, and therefore political, power in the hands of the federal government at the center. Politicians will be interested in this power, and some hard bargains will be struck.

Nobody yet dares to guess at the identities of the possible partners, but things may develop in either of two ways. Either there will be further subdivision, increasingly along tribal and linguistic lines, leading to something closely resembling anarchy, or there will be the formation of strong, new and incorrupt political alliances, leading to stability. A great deal will depend on the caliber of political leadership available, but the continuing activity of some of the former regime's political leaders does not inspire total confidence.

All this presupposes an early return to civilian rule, which in itself is unlikely, because of the antipathy which has always existed between the Hausas of the North and the Yorubas of the West, and which not even a war has eradicated. The Northerners are still suspicious of the Yorubas, especially now that many of them are taking advantage of their superior educational qualifications to try to win a larger role in the political and administrative life of the country. This is also true of the social level; Yorubas are to be found in increasing numbers in the North, filling the jobs that the Ibos filled before secession and, presumably, making many of the same mistakes and running the risk of alienating the local population. As things stand, the Army is firmly controlled by Northerners, and they will hardly submit calmly to a civilian government they suspect is too influenced by the distrusted Yorubas.

Any continuance of military rule poses its own problems, not least those presented by the old adage about men who live by the sword. There are already rumblings among some of the younger officers at the front at the activities of the armchair soldiers at the rear; the possibility of another coup cannot be ruled out. And, if all this were not enough, there is clearly going to be a major struggle after the war between different nations anxious to establish a bridgehead of influence in West Africa by helping the Nigerian reconstruction program. The Soviet and Czech governments have already mentioned the possibilities of massive loans, and American spokesmen, while vaguer about quantities, have made it clear that they will not be slow to help either. All in all, the problems of peace may well prove more intractable than the problems of war.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW MAN AT H.E.W.

Wilbur Cohen, dated New Dealer

JAMES J. GRAHAM

The recent appointment of Wilbur Cohen as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, evoked something less than enthusiasm among those who believe there must be radical reforms in public assistance ("welfare") administration. Cohen is a veteran New Dealer who assisted at the birth, in 1935, of Social Security legislation (Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance) which is generally considered the greatest domestic achievement of the Roosevelt Administration. Cohen has never suggested that Social Security could ever be a complete substitute for public assistance and over the years he has urged reforms in PA, including higher budgets, incentive allowances and elimination of state residence requirements. But he has never been a welfare "rights" advocate nor has he ever questioned the principle of the "means test." Rather, Cohen has tended to exaggerate the merits of "social insurance" at the expense of welfare "handouts." Last year, for example, as Under Secretary of HEW, he supported the cutbacks in aid to Families of Dependent Children, reportedly calling them "regrettable, but necessary" to insure passage of the Social Security increases, which were part of the legislative package.

When his appointment as HEW Secretary was announced, Cohen remarked that the Social Security formula could be enlarged by increasing the payroll tax contributions of both employers and employees, to cover a portion of the welfare caseload. Aside from the fact that such a proposal shifts attention from more meaningful reforms like the "negative income tax," using Social Security funds for relief payments is a reactionary device, for several reasons.

The payroll tax is retrogressive. Employer and employee share the cost, 8.8 percent of the first $7,800 of gross annual earnings. The family of the laborer who contributes what is to him a disproportionate percentage of his income to Social Security is also least likely to be able to live on a monthly Social Security check when he is disabled, retired or dead. Payments are predicated not upon need but upon accumulated earnings. Because the low earner, who hovers most of his life just above the poverty line, usually dies propertyless, the modest Social Security death benefit available to his widow is not enough to keep her off the relief rolls. Nationwide, about seven percent of the Social Security beneficiaries (including those covered by Medicare) also receive welfare in the form of Old Age Assistance. In Alabama, the percentage is 16 and in Texas, one out of every five retired or disabled workers is also on welfare. Social Security payments cannot be attracted to satisfy debts, but they are deducted from the welfare allowance.

The 1967 amendments increased the minimum monthly allowance from $44 to $55, or less than $3 per week. The average benefit was raised not by a flat amount, but by thirteen *percent*, thus paralleling the widening gulf in earnings. between the factory hand who took home $60 per week in 1960 and $75 today and the plumber whose normal wages rose in the same period from $120 to $200. In other words, Social Security is cream for the Irish coffee of the progressively affluent craftsman who dominates the affairs of the AFL-CIO. For the poor man, Social Security disappears into his welfare budget. In such cases it is difficult to believe that the "earned" benefit carries with it any glimmer of human dignity.

Wilbur Cohen and the Democrats have rejoiced with each expansion of OASDI coverage; until recently, this had the major effect of reducing the OAA caseload. But in 1950, Congress decided that the system should be completely self-supporting and repealed a provision permitting appropriations from the general Treasury revenues. From then on all increases in costs were paid for by imposing hardship on the marginal worker. Reducing the relief rolls in this fashion eases the drain on the general revenues, most of which derive from the progressive income tax, but it shifts more of the burden of supporting the destitute to two special classes of citizens, employers and workers.

In order for the Social Security system to maintain its actuarial soundness, it will be able to encompass only the aged and possibly the blind and permanently and totally disabled. These groups (totalling about 2,700,000) constitute less than half of the nation's welfare recipients. They are the "deserving" poor, but what about the more controversial category of abandoned mothers and their children? Upon his appointment, Wilbur Cohen seemed to echo the popular prejudice against the welfare stereotype, and, incredibly, he also derided the one sub-category of relief that constitutes a tiny and stable portion of the welfare caseload: the family with an unemployed father. Ac-

JAMES J. GRAHAM *is associate director of the Project on Social Welfare Law sponsored by the N.Y.U. School of Law.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cording to Cohen, "This is the crux of the issue: why the hell should I pay some 35-year-old guy with a wife and two kids just to sit on his front porch? You don't mind paying welfare to a 75-year-old disabled guy. But it's American—the American, Protestant ethic—to be against giving money for doing nothing . . . Now, we don't have this feeling about Social Security."

Only 21 states participate in the unemployed-father segment of the Aid to Families of Dependent Children program. It constitutes less than ten percent of the whole AFDC program and in March, 1968, it dipped for the eighth straight month in exact correlation to the rise in employment. A few drifters do appear on the rolls but the White House reported in 1967 that only one percent of all reliefers are capable of self-support. The AFDC mother, for example, has an average of three children, cannot afford a baby sitter and is therefore unable to work. Still, the myth of the lazy reliefer who refuses to work persists.

Isn't it about time that we stop punishing welfare recipients with the Protestant ethic? Even though the incidence of poverty in America has steadily declined, the poor as a class will never disappear. Their plight cannot be isolated from the economic and social context in which poverty breeds. And their plight is made harder to bear because the public regards all kinds of public assistance as handouts. Unfortunately, spokesmen for the poor like Wilbur Cohen have encouraged them in that belief. The Congressional record is laden with pompous remarks by Democrats contrasting the "vested right" to Social Security with welfare "charity."

Ironically, in 1935 the craft unions were cool even to Social Security, which they viewed as a threat to the free enterprise system. All of organized labor finally did accept Social Security, however, just as some of the unions later came to value Medicaid and to lobby against Republican cuts in that program. Medicaid became respectable, however, even though administered within the Welfare Department, because medical benefits were not distributed in the welfare manner. More important than the higher eligibility requirements and truncated investigations, was the concept that an indigent had a *right* to receive Medicaid.

In short, relief formulas must be found that will be based on the right of an abandoned mother to AFDC, if not for her sake, at least for her children and the good of society. I hope I am wrong about Wilbur Cohen; he now heads a Department that badly needs a transfusion of bold ideas. But Cohen's continued passion for the merits of Social Security does not augur well for drastic welfare reforms. Moreover, the whole question of welfare has become a race issue. Unfashionable and therefore repressed prejudices against blacks pop up in quaint phrases like "let's get those welfare whores off their asses and into factories!"

Secretary Cohen, in his second interview, announced that he thought that the Riots Commission Report had oversimplified the cause of riots by blaming white racism. This was further evidence that the new man at HEW may be just another tired face in the Great Society.

WONDROUS STRANGE

THE SCREEN

Again and again as I was watching producer-director Stanley Kubrick's spectacular new epic "2001: a Space Odyssey," I wondered if I'd like living in this world of tomorrow. Actually it's the universe of tomorrow: it seems that by 2001 we have conquered space and go skittering in enormous spaceships from planet to planet, and there are even spacestations in the skies with hotel accommodations (by Hilton, of course) for weary travelers. The year 2001 isn't very far away, and I doubt if we'd advance this much in 30-odd years; but who am I to argue with anything presented in this film which is supposed to be scientifically correct and okayed by scientists and science-fiction experts. I wonder, however, if these experts also approved of the characters in the movie who struck me as a rather unemotional and uninspired lot. Out of fairness, though, I must add that most of the characters we encounter are astronauts or scientists or government officials. Evidently by 2001, there won't be any just common folk around.

"2001" is full of surprises, but no one should really be surprised at anything Stanley Kubrick (who made "Paths of Glory," "Spartacus," "Lolita," "Dr. Strangelove") does in his pictures, each one of which is quite different from the one before. At times, "2001" seems a bit like "Strangelove." But "2001" has none of the earlier film's vulgarity, and its humor, whenever it pops up amidst the metaphysical themes and awe-inspiring vast stretches of terrestial space, is delightfully subtle. The screenplay, written by Kubrick and the eminent science-fiction writer, Arthur C. Clarke, is surprisingly short on dialogue. No doubt this is good for a spectacle in which the visuals are so beautiful. It's rather amusing to have a group of people talking trivia and small talk as they're gathered at tea at a spacestation in a gorgeous sky full of odd spacecrafts floating around. And what's more, these strangely-shaped crafts seem to be keeping time to the sound track's lovely music. And what do you think they're playing? "The Blue Danube" and who ever thought that up should have an extra round of applause. So should Clarke or Kubrick or both of them for making a computer named Hal the most interesting and brightest character in the picture.

Two handsome lads, Keir Dullea and Gary Lockwood, play the two main astronauts well, but in an expressionless manner that no doubt director Kubrick wanted. So when mechanical Hal, which has an amazing "brain" and a big eye that sees *everything*, comes out with the script's best

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wisecracks, he steals the show. The episode in which Hal also tries to steal the spaceship probably symbolizes man in 2001 being taken over by his own machines.

Fortunately I had read Arthur Clarke's fine short story, *The Sentinel,* before I saw "2001," and knew that its theme (about a group of men who find on the moon a monolith that could have been built only by a superior intelligence) was the starting point for the movie which expands this subject considerably but never explains its mystery. In the picture, the first monolith turns up (probably on earth) among a group of apes who treat this large black slab with reverence and awe and almost seem to learn from it. For a few minutes I thought I was seeing "Planet of the Apes" again and was going to learn how the apes in that movie got to be the wise guys and high moguls. But then "2001" skips several million years to men who are investigating a monolithic slab on the moon. Perhaps I'm asking too much to wish that some of the sparse dialogue in the script had been devoted to solving the who, why and how of this skillfully-made monolith. Is it a warning similar to that in "La Dolce Vita" to tell us to stop horsing around and get back to basic values? Is it a sentinel left there by an intelligence from a star who is still trying to signal us? Is it a shrine of some kind? In any case, the film's finale, after astronaut Dullea has whizzed through space on an incredibly beautiful, almost psychedelic flight to Jupiter, is the most baffling of all. He lands, we know not on what planet or perhaps back on earth, in a slick Louis XVI bedroom (complete with Watteau pictures) and goes through a series of aging incidents in time to be born again.

I have only one real complaint against "2001." It is too long and should be cut. But its sets, color photography, and special effects are magnificent. It is easy to see where the $10 million went. I should have preferred to have some characters for whom we cared. But on the whole, I found the film fascinating. In a "Space Odyssey," Stanley Kubrick has a right to get as fanciful as he likes, and he spares no fancy. As for the mysterious monolith, well, why not? Right now radio signals from the depth of space and repeated at intervals are baffling our scientists. Let *them* figure out the slab.

PHILIP T. HARTUNG

CHESTNUT HILL COLLEGE

CONDUCTED BY THE SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH

Accredited Catholic college for women. Liberal Arts and Science.

WRITE:

REGISTRAR, CHESTNUT HILL COLLEGE
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19118

THE SELF-TORMENTOR

THE STAGE

Other dramatists write plays; Tennessee Williams rewrites plays. He does this in two ways. There is hardly a recent full-length drama of his that wasn't first a short story, then a one-act play, then tried out in one long version in Florida and another at Spoleto, then came out in *Esquire* in revised form, then was further revised for Broadway, where it was sometimes, after failing, revived in a rewritten version which also failed. Sometimes there is a slight departure from this schema: there may, for instance, be a London or a San Francisco recension; or Broadway may settle for one disastrous production. There may or may not be a further revision for the movies.

But all this would be merely laughable—no, let me revise that, pathetic; what is heartrending is the *other* rewriting Wiliams does: the appalling self-parroting and self-parody. *The Seven Descents of Myrtle* (called originally, like the story on which it is based, *Kingdom of Earth*) is almost completely plagiarized from other Williams works. If one had the stomach for it, one could play a game with one's theater companion: who can spot the source of this speech or scene first? In dismal sequence, almost all of Williams' works parade through this pastiche —always coarsened or reduced to the absurd.

The Seven Descents of Myrtle concerns Lot, a young Southern mother's boy, dying of TB, and his half-brother, Chicken, a roughneck to whom the ramshackle house by the river will go upon Lot's death. It is the time of periodic floods that drive the inmates to the roof, where Chicken, (hence his name) quenches his thirst by biting the head off a chicken and drinking its blood. Lot is still clinging to the ghost of his dead, refined mother, and wants to keep Chicken, whom their crude father begat on a Negro, from inheriting. So he marries Myrtle, an amiable tramp, on a television program on which she has already won any number of household appliances. He brings her home, but, as his lung condition worsens, retires to the upstairs bedroom. He seems to be impotent and homosexual as well as tubercular, and now concentrates on sending the frustrated Myrtle down to the kitchen to get Chicken drunk and steal the deed to the property from him.

Now the descents of Myrtle begin. There are only four left in the play, which had 45 minutes cut during tryouts; four plus a very important fifth one. As Myrtle peregrinates between Chicken and Lot, and keeps getting drunker herself, Lot becomes more hostile to her, and Chicken, though he too insults and humiliates her, more attracted. As the flood keeps rising, Lot's life sinks; he dons his beloved mother's clothes, stumbles down the stairs, and dies *en travesti*. Meanwhile, Myrtle and Chicken have sealed their compact with her final and supreme

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

descent: she goes down on him. In exchange, he will take her up on the roof with him, and will, when the waters settle, settle down with her in the house that is now his.

The basic agon of the play is "the subduing of the woman" motif which we know best from such plays as *Summer and Smoke*, *A Streetcar Named Desire* and *Night of the Iguana*; it is here enacted comically between Chicken and Myrtle, in a way reminiscent of *The Rose Tattoo*. The subsidiary contest between Lot and Myrtle, is the motif of "the unfulfilled woman," which can be found in every Williams story, novel or play. The particular variant here —"vital woman failing with exquisite young man"—we know from *Suddenly Last Summer*, from Blanche's monologue about her marriage in *Streetcar*, and, in a less pure form, from *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*.

But the self-plagiarism and self-parody are particularly blatant in the dialogue. In his earlier plays, Williams, who started out as a poet, often managed to be quietly, pervasively poetic. Now we get things like, "The moon is out, like the bleary eye of a drunkard"; or, more philosophically, "What are you laughing at?—At life.—I think it's a bad dream.—A bad dream can be funny." For psychology, we get, "There's two ways to treat a hysterical woman: one is to slap her face, the other is to lay her. Sometimes you've got to do both." Or a statement about there being more to love (or sex—I forget which, but I doubt that Williams ever distinguished between them) than "jumping up and down on each other's eggs"—which seems to me particularly inept in a supposedly heterosexual context.

Worst of all is the humor. Thus a utensil elicits the following exchange: "*Myrtle*: Oh, that's a man-size in-instrument.—*Chicken*: Well, don't you like a man-size instrument?" Or this, apropos some French fries: "Still hot?—Who?—I meant the potatoes.—Oh, is that what you meant?" And sometimes this turns real tough (a throwback to Stanley and Blanche), as when Chicken disputes Myrtle's claims to living off the musical theater: "You kick up your right leg, and you kick up your left leg, and in between your legs you make your living." With writing like that, what do you need symbolic overtones (the flood) or social undertones (Chicken's mixed blood) for? You kick up your symbols, you kick up your social significance, but it's in between that you make your living.

Joe Mielziner has parodied his own previous sets for Williams plays; José Quintero has again directed flaccidly and aimlessly; and the actors are left pretty much to their own devices. Brian Bedford, as Lot, barely takes any of it seriously; Harry Guardino, as Chicken, falls back on his good comic timing and his good looks; both come off relatively unscathed. But Estelle Parsons minces movements and words, and generally tries to be a giant, sexy panda bear, which, I am afraid, comes out nauseating. But why should the actors and director know what to do with the play when the author didn't? Thus Chicken, who begins as an illiterate brute, ends up as a poet who rhapsodizes about owning one's house and land, one's "kingdom of earth." None of it makes sense. There are two ways to treat a hysterical play: one is to slap it down, the other to lay it to rest. In this case, you've got to do both. *(Closed at the Ethel Barrymore)*

JOHN SIMON

BOOKS

The rutted road of radicalism in America

Critics Of Society

T. B. BOTTOMORE

Pantheon, $4.95

STAUGHTON LYND

T. B. Bottomore is a British sociologist known to many American readers through his selections from the early writings of Karl Marx. Bottomore's newest book, *Critics Of Society*, originated as a series of radio talks in Canada where Bottomore now teaches. It surveys the course of American radical thought in the twentieth century, from Progressive pragmatism (Beard, Dewey and their colleagues) through the literary radicalism of the 1930's (Dos Passos, for instance) to Mills, Riesman and the New Left.

Bottomore is interested in the relationship between coherent social criticism and depth of social protest. Contrasting America's experience with that of Europe and Canada, he finds Left ideology in America fragmentary because Left social protest has been shallow and sporadic. Until about 1900, radicalism in the United States was inhibited by the availability of western land as well as by the existence of democratic political institutions. Whereas in Europe critics "were obliged to look to the future for a better organization of society," in the United States they tended to look backward toward a Jeffersonian golden age. Pragmatism was the first American school of thought "at all comparable in scope and coherence with the schools of criticism in Europe." But World War I destroyed it; and the Jazz Age, like the subsequent 1950's, was a period which, in the words of Scott Fitzgerald, "had no interest in politics at all."

Nor did the depression of the 1930's give rise to an American radical ideology. Bottomore's treatment of this period, enriched by considerable reading in contemporary periodicals, is the most original section of his book. He

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

argues that the influence of Marxism on American intellectual life in the 1930's has been exaggerated. Its vogue was "chiefly among the literary intellectuals," and "what has been seen subsequently as the acceptance of Marxism was often enough only the expression of a general sympathy with socialism, or more specifically with the economic and social policies of the U.S.S.R."

No broad radical movement arose. Workingmen, as the *Middletown* study indicated, tended to interpret unemployment as a personal calamity rather than the predicament of a class. It was a faithful reflection of the managerial style of New Deal reformism that the most original social theory of the decade appeared in James Burnham's *The Managerial Revolution* (1941). This reviewer can recall how as the teenage son of radical parents he struggled to reconcile the socialist humanism of Edmund Wilson's *To The Finland Station* (1940) with the more convincing pessimism of Burnham. To this day American radicals have not succeeded in overcoming the equation of socialism and bureaucratic despotism which writers like Burnham, Orwell and Dwight McDonald posited a quarter century ago.

A third era of radical resurgence has thus far also failed to produce a social theory on a European scale. Mills came closest; but Mills, Bottomore observes, "was unable to conceive with any clarity a possible alternative" to the United States of the 1950's, or to point with any confidence to an agency of change. In contrast to Mills, critics such as Riesman and Galbraith proclaimed the need for personal autonomy and investment in the public sphere, with scant appreciation of the power structure which stands in the way.

As in other periods, so in the 1950's and 1960's these inadequacies in social theory stem from the character of the underlying social movements, Bottomore believes. To a considerable extent the New Left derives not from class conflict but from a conflict of generations. And "generational groups are by their nature impermanent and their members mobile: no one remains a teenager very long." Hence: "For the student movement in the U.S.A. to become an enduring radical force it would be necessary that the present radicalism should be handed on intact to each new generation of students over a fairly long period of time (and this depends upon many other factors in the society at large), and that students, after leaving the university, could be inducted into other radical movements—a labor movement, or a progressive intelligentsia—which, however, do not yet exist." Not even the black liberation movement provides "a reliable and enduring social basis" for radical thought. The precondition for the emergence of an American radical ideology is a social basis "less ephemeral than a student movement, less confined than the Negro revolt."

Bottomore recognizes, however, that the inchoate character of New Left social thought is not only a symptom of weakness but also "reflects some positive attitudes—humanism allied with skepticism, or at least an experimental and empirical approach to problems; an egalitarianism which repudiates the exposition of some orthodox doctrine by infallible teachers; and a strong belief in the importance of personal moral choices." Indeed, it appears that he, like the New Left itself, is uncertain whether American radicalism should strive toward and hope to create a social theory functionally equivalent to nineteenth-century Marxism.

The question is whether one must choose between, on the one hand, existentialism with its emphasis on individual decision and its relative uninterest in the social environment, or, on the other hand, a theory so confidently all-explaining and essentially deterministic as Marxism. Along with America's young radicals, Bottomore seems to be feeling his way toward a third possibility. This would be a social theory which, in the manner of "participatory democracy" and "the philosophical socialism of the young Marx," organized itself around a vision of the future. Again and again, Bottomore stresses the failure of American radicals "to outline, in however sketchy a manner, some alternative conception of society." Such a theory would differ from existentialism in looking toward a collective, not merely a personal, future. It would also differ from Marxism in laying emphasis less on the analysis of what is than on the articulation of what might be.

When Marx wrote in the mid-nineteenth century, an orientation toward the future may have been Utopian in the sense that the objective conditions

For Lay People, the Clergy, and Religious

WORSHIP

A review exploring the current renewal of the Liturgy

Where

The Meaning and Structure of Christian Worship

and

Recent Documents of Liturgical Reform

Are Discussed by Leading Experts in the Field

$5.00 one year 10 issues annually $9.00 two years

THE LITURGICAL PRESS

St. John's Abbey Collegeville, Minnesota 56321

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for its realization did not exist. This is hardly the case today. At least in the United States, if not in the developing socialist nations, objective conditions are "over-ripe" in the sense that economic resources are available for the creation of almost any desirable society. What is lacking is vision and will.

The Mystery of the Supernatural

HENRI DE LUBAC, S. J.

Herder & Herder, $6.50

ANSELM ATKINS

Herder and Herder (may it live forever) made a mistake in publishing this book. A few institutions and professionals will buy it as a matter of course, but there is no reason why anyone interested in theology should read it. Don't read it, don't read this review. This is a non-review about a non-book.

Chapter Six of Samuel Beckett's *Murphy* bears the motto *Amor intellectualis quo Murphy se ipsum amat*, and begins like this: "It is most unfortunate, but the point of this story has been reached where a justification of the expression 'Murphy's mind' has to be attempted." It is most unfortunate too that de Lubac reached the point where he had to write a 300-page book on the words *omnis intellectus naturaliter desiderat divinae substantiae visionem*. For people who can't read *Winnie Ille Pu*, and others under 30, that means "every (sic) intellect naturally wants to see the divine substance." Think now, what Beckett could do with those words of St. Thomas —imagine the chapter that would go with them. Beckett, whose Moran asks, "Is it true that the infant Saint-Roch refused suck on Wednesdays and Fridays?" and "Might not the beatific vision become a source of boredom, in the long run?". One automatically averts one's eyes at the prospect of a hero like de Lubac being pilloried, and it is admittedly ungrateful to sic Beckett on him; but this is the kind of question his book (if read) will have to endure.

De Lubac might not have been driven to rewrite his *Surnaturel* had the magisterium and the local Thomists not originally responded to his thesis so negatively. It is too bad the pope brought the issue up, too bad de Lubac nursed his wounds so long. But I suppose when you have an encyclical shaken at you by such a celestial being as Pius XII you are bound to be a little shaken yourself. If *Surnaturel* had been officially left alone it might have had the ambiguous impact of any idea that still needs trimming and gradually gets it, like the large crude thoughts of Teilhard. But de Lubac, along with his critics, has been maneuvered into a controversy that will perish of exhaustion before it influences theology one whit.

De Lubac tries to explain his position (past and present), defend it, convince his critics, and interpret his predecessors, all at once. Whether he has finally proved what he wants to prove, whatever that may be, I haven't the vaguest idea. I did read the book, even (a lot of) the Latin. No doubt genteel quarterlies will carry perspicacious reviews by men who have stakes in neo-scholas-

Next to J.S. Bach himself, father of 20, we believe that AR high-fidelity components reproduce Bach best. Their natural, uncolored sound comes from designs AR has developed for home use, although many engineers use AR equipment for broadcast and recording work, too. Relax and listen to Bach at AR Music Rooms in Grand Central Station (N.Y.) or Brattle St. (Cambridge). Write for details on AR speaker systems, turntables and amplifier. ACOUSTIC RESEARCH, INC., 24 Thorndike St., Cambridge, Massachusetts 02141.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His Presence in the World

A Study of Eucharistic Worship and Theology
by Nicholas Lash

Liturgy is at the heart of Christian renewal. But what is at the heart of liturgy? The preoccupation with changing forms of worship over the past few years has tended to obscure what these forms are supposed to achieve: a sharper awareness of Christ's presence.

As the Mass becomes more familiar to all who participate in it, there is a growing urgency to develop a theology of the Eucharist based upon the Mass and its meaning today—not upon old theological manuals. Father Nicholas Lash, a young, English priest-theologian, has made a significant contribution to this area of theology.

216 pages At your bookstore Cloth, $5.25

PFLAUM PRESS
38 WEST FIFTH STREET
DAYTON, OHIO 45402

REPORTER WANTED

Diocesan newspapers serve local needs and interests. The Catholic Review does this with reporters and correspondents in Annapolis, Baltimore, Cumberland, Frederick, Hagerstown. Diocesan newspapers also cover the world scene. The Catholic Review does this with N.C., R.N.S. and its own correspondents in Rome, London, Honolulu. Community recognition includes awards for extraordinary reporting of such ordinary subjects as alcoholism, pornography, motorcycles. Local book reviews (by such reviewers as Avery Dulles, Raymond Brown, Bishop Lord) and local play reviews are widely read. The Catholic Review has a full-time librarian, modern darkroom facilities, air conditioned offices. Its pay is comparable to Maryland dailies. Sound like a good place to work? It is, with fully-paid Blue Cross and Blue Shield plus a retirement plan. There's an opening now for a versatile, talented reporter. Write: A. E. P. Wall, Editor, The Catholic Review, Box 777, Baltimore, Md. 21203.

YOUNG IN THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST

HOLY CROSS BROTHERS
Teaching • Foreign Missions • Social Work
Office Work • Technical Trades
(High school graduation required)
COME ALIVE WITH HOLY CROSS BROTHERS

Please send vocation literature to me: CW

Name_____ Age_____
Address_____
City_____ State_____ Zip_____
.....Send your request to one of these addresses.....

Brother Donald Hanzel, C.S.C.
St. Edward's University
Austin, Texas 78704

Brother John Lavelle, C.S.C.
Holy Cross Junior College
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

ticism (*Downside Review* succumbed early). Surely some of the authors cited in the 1,138 footnotes will want to speak out in their own behalf or in behalf of their honored dead (who in the notes already enjoy the advantage of numbers). But we have other business.

Let me read you some more Beckett. He goes on: "Happily we need not concern ourselves with this apparatus [Murphy's mind] as it really was—that would be an extravagance and an impertinence —but solely with what it felt and pictured itself to be." A quick allegory: consider the whole *massa damnata* of patristic-medieval theology as a vast, intricate, Kafka-ish apparatus, a rectifier, whose function is to refine beautiful stories until the last detail of every story in its repertoire coheres with every detail of every other. Murphy-de Lubac sits inside it spinning out consistent-myth.

In a sense this is all right because it is eventually what every theologian has to do. But it helps if you can start off in the right century and in the right world, and it helps if the myth is pleasing—though of course it cannot be expected that a myth be beautiful for 311 pages. (I take it back—*Whitehead's Process and Reality* is beautiful for 533 pages.) But once in a while a theologian ought to climb out of the machine (which is a good trick if you can do it, like getting out of the labyrinth), do what Nietzsche's man did (blink), and then do what Wittgenstein says do: look and see.

I want to be deadly clear. This book is not theology. It does not do what theology should be doing. The main issue that I hope to raise in this review, indirectly anyway, is precisely that: what do you do nowadays when you do theology? What is it? The word *nowadays* makes all the difference, and those who do not agree that it does are still seeing the question only from their own side.

The argument de Lubac is embroiled in is whether there is a "natural order" in addition to the supernatural, or whether these two should be conceived as existentially one; and whether man is ordered to some natural earthly happiness, or whether he has an innate ordination toward God as his end. If I have got it straight. (Blink.) I remember reading something about all this by Cornelius Ernst in *New Blackfriars*, so there must be something to it. Rahner (Karl) also writes on it, and is actually easier to construe than de Lubac. But when you ask whether man desires "to see God's substance," I think you have to take into account the expressions and self-understandings of the two billion men living today, and not just quote texts drawn from an elite tradition. Maybe Beckett's characters really do want to see God. Someone might argue that they do; that Beckett does; I might argue it myself some day. But Beckett is the kind of man we have to start with.

What de Lubac gets us into is the question of Order. How shall man conceive and symbolize his place in the universe? This is what I meant by myth-making. Whether we call the state we live in "nature" or "grace" or a mixture of the two finally becomes a matter of how you want to tell your story; for it makes no difference empirically. I sug-

Educational

INDIANA

Saint Mary's College Notre Dame

Fully accredited liberal arts college for women. Degrees: B.A., B.S., B.F.A., B. Music. Interdepartmental Christianity & Culture Program. Academic exchange program with University of Notre Dame. Conducted by the Sisters of the Holy Cross. Graduate School of Education for men and women. Catalog:
Saint Mary's College
Box 71, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

NEW JERSEY

Delbarton School

Morristown, New Jersey. An hour's drive from the George Washington Bridge or Holland Tunnel. A country day and boarding school for boys conducted by Benedictine Monks. Six forms, comprising the 7th and 8th grades and four years of college preparatory courses. Small classes. Thorough guidance department. Complete athletic program. Write for prospectus to the Headmaster.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gest that the place to go for a contemporary reformulation of the problem is Eric Voegelin's *New Science of Politics* and *Order and History*. Another starting place, the latest I can mention at this writing, is the middle paragraph on p. 629 of this winter's *Continuum* by Walter H. Capps (then read the whole article).

The last thing I want to say in this report—which, like the book, has little value except for the sociologist or psychopathologist of religion—is what Rilke said through the torso of Apollo. To all theologians for whom de Lubac still makes sense: You must change your life. Beginning with the books on your shelf.

As for Father de Lubac himself—may his name live forever.

A Primer on Food, Agriculture and Public Policy

EARL O. HEADY

Random House, $4.95

MARC LANDY

For Mr. Heady, the problems faced by American agriculture are reducible to one simple fact. There are too many farmers. The agricultural plant has become so efficient that the smaller relatively less efficient producers are unable to compete successfully and serve only as a drag on the market. Mr. Heady's solution is to encourage these farmers to abandon their farms and to compensate them for the hardship involved. Many of his specific plans, especially that calling for federal compensation for non-agricultural vocational training and guidance programs in rural schools, have considerable merit. But his over-all policy goal, the reduction of agricultural manpower, is based upon a narrow view of the nation's manpower needs, and a series of economic half-truths.

In this volume, size is automatically equated with efficiency. This equation strikes such a responsive note among America's economic and social planners that Mr. Heady feels no need to bolster his assertion that small farmers are necessarily inefficient with even a single bit of evidence. But the ability of small farmers to organize themselves to share the high fixed costs accruing to investment in machinery, thereby spreading the cost and insuring maximum use of the machinery, coupled with their inherently lower administrative and labor costs, makes Mr. Heady's assertion a dubious one at best.

The ouster of great numbers of small farmers would lead to a heavy influx of manpower into urban areas. On the whole, these emigrants lack the skills to compete successfully for jobs in what is already a tight labor market. Displaced farmers would drift into areas that are already seriously overcrowded. And the adverse effects of mechanization on unskilled and semi-skilled workers would hit these new arrivals even harder in the city than they did on the farm. They would have to compete with ex-sharecroppers, tenant farmers and migratory workers whose arrival barely pre-dated their own, for the irregular, menial work which contemporary black radicals call "nigger" jobs. The farmer shares with the long-time ghetto resident the fact that he is no longer young nor easily re-trainable.

The inevitability which Mr. Heady ascribes to the process of agricultural shrinkage is a combination of economic fact and fiction, converted into an "iron law." It is true that in economies like our own, where food consumption is well above the starvation level, there is a relatively inelastic demand for farm products. If food prices drop, the rise in demand will not be proportionate to the size of their decline. Therefore, increased farm production, resulting in lower food prices, will not lead to increased farm income. Mr. Heady adds to this fact of agricultural life the myth that the farmer, by order of the Deity and Adam Smith, is a price taker. He must bring all his goods to market and accept whatever price he is offered. He does not acknowledge the possibility that farmers can organize to control the *supply* of farm produce that actually reaches the market as a means

The first evidence of a new commitment to publishing about the religious quest—

The best view of the whole scene:
The Religious Situation: 1968
1024 pp. $15.00

A fresh look at one great tradition:
The Catholic Crisis
BY THOMAS F. O'DEA $5.95

An iconoclastic revision of Luther:
The Theses Were Not Posted
BY ERWIN ISERLOH $5.95

Beacon Press Boston 02108

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If You Are Concerned about

- The Nominees for President
- Neglect of Our Inner Cities
- Authority and Freedom in the Church
- Ending the Vietnam war
- Christian-Marxist Dialogue
- Change and Church Renewal

Commonweal is the journal of opinion for you. Read each week's topical feature articles and editorials plus the comment of such articulate columnists as William V. Shannon, Harvey Cox, Michael Novak, William Pfaff, Daniel Callahan and Robert McAfee Brown.

Discover for yourself the insights that come from reading *Commonweal* regularly; send in the attached coupon (or a facsimile) and save two-thirds of the single copy price.

TRIAL OFFER

----17 Weeks for $2----

FOR NEW SUBSCRIBERS

Commonweal
232 Madison Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10016

For the enclosed $2 send me the next 17 issues

Name

Street

City, State, Zip

☐ I prefer a full year for $10.

5/3

of raising their aggregate income.

This seemingly academic point is being put to the test by the National Farmers Organization. This association of small farmers is seeking to achieve control over the farm-produce market through collective bargaining. They are attempting to limit the supply that reaches the processers by keeping their produce on the farm. They are currently engaged in a holdout on grain; and this will be extended to milk and dairy products as soon as market conditions are favorable. Although the NFO represents only a minority of small farmers, it has great strength in certain key regions of the Great Plains and Mid-West. By forcing processors in these critical areas to come to terms, the NFO hopes to demonstrate across the nation the feasibility of collective bargaining and organized supply control. The price of grain has already risen slightly, as processors attempt to induce goods back onto the market. Latest indications suggest that the bulk of the NFO farmers are ignoring the incremental rise and sticking to their original demands.

If we are willing to acknowledge that the shrinkage of the agricultural sector is undesirable, that it is not economically inevitable, and that a viable method for raising farm income is here being demonstrated, what should be the goals and content of government policy with regard to agriculture and rural life in general? Those who favor doing away with the system of price supports, currently administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, justify this aim in terms of a desire to place agriculture back in the "free" market. Such a move makes little sense until the small farmers actually wrest some market power away from the processors and large commercial farmers who are currently in undisputed control. The government could help by withdrawing the tax exemption currently enjoyed by the lobby for these interests, The American Farm Bureau Federation, and by subjecting their ologopolistic practices to Department of Justice scrutiny.

After the Civil War, ex-slaves were promised forty acres and a mule. The problem of rural (and through migration) urban poverty can no longer be solved by the creation of this sort of free peasantry. However, the resettlement of the rural poor on tracts capable of using the most modern methods of farm organization, technology and management would be a far cheaper solution than any attempt to rehabilitate these people once they have been uprooted and forced to join the swelling ranks of the urban poor.

Such a scheme was attempted briefly during the New Deal by the Resettlement Administration under the ingenious leadership of Rexford Tugwell. It was quickly scuttled by a Congress that considered its program to be collectivist and utopian. Only through this sort of "utopian" planning, on a grand scale, can we escape the pragmatic shortsightedness that is the stock in trade of economic planners like Mr. Heady and launch a comprehensive attack on rural and urban poverty.

CORRESPONDENCE

(Continued from page 195)

its eyes to the brutalizing inhumanity of ghetto conditions. Rotten housing is only part of it. Black militants are subject to surveillance, their homes entered

Publisher's Secretary

Catholic magazine, N.Y. City, needs sec. Exp. or bright beginner. Corresp., steno. or rapid notes. Record-keeping, receiving books and mss. Good salary, pleasant office, fringes. Box 426, Commonweal.

SECRET HIDING PLACES, Elizabethan houses, and contemporary illustrations on English Recusant history. All available with lecturer in May: New York, Washington, D.C., and Wisconsin. Suitable for Newman groups, history depts., etc. APPLY: Rev. John P. Marmion, SS. Thomas & Stephen, Market Drayton, Shropshire, England, OR Rev. J. Thomas Finucan, Assumption H.S., Wis. Rapids, Wis. 54494.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUMMER INSTITUTE OF JEWISH STUDIES

Co-Sponsored by
Marymount College
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith
at Marymount College, Tarrytown, N.Y.

JUNE 10-21

An intensive two-week program designed for faculties in Catholic universities and seminaries; qualified seminary and graduate students; school teachers, and individuals involved in community projects.

Courses: The Crucifixion as an Ecumenical Problem; A History of Biblical Thought; Key Issues in Contemporary Jewish Theology.

Lecturers: Rev. Dominic Crossan, o.s.m.; Dr. Asher Finkel; Rev. Edward Flannery; Rabbi Martin Siegel; Prof. Stephen Steinberg; Prof. Michael Wyschograd.

$75 Tuition, $75 Room & Board
Scholarships Available

Application deadline May 24. Write:
Dr. W. M. Zeik, Director
Summer Institute of Jewish Studies
Marymount College
Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591

EMMAUS NEEDS MONEY

Fire Dept. demands urgent $3,000 repairs on Emmaus House, an experimental and ecumenical community and ministry. Please, please help.

Emmaus House
241 E. 116 St., NYC 10029
(212) 348-5622

TEGAWITHA

CATHOLIC CAMP FOR GIRLS, 6-16

Atop the Poconos. On private lake. All land sports, swimming, riding, dramatics, dancing, crafts, tutoring. 8 or 4 weeks. Private chapel on grounds.

51st Year

For catalog, address:

Mrs. James P. Lynch, Director
Camp Tegawitha, Box G
Tobyhanna, Pa.

and searched, they are often picked up, questioned and released without being charged, or jailed with excessive bail.

The Philadelphia chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union reports a distinct increase in police harassment, not only of blacks, but of anti-war demonstrators and hippies, since Frank Rizzo was appointed Police Commissioner last year. Following the November 17 demonstration of black students at the School Board—viciously broken up by uniformed police led by Rizzo—the ACLU joined as *amicus curiae* in litigation brought against the police.

Testimony and evidence introduced during this case brought to light the inhuman treatment of juveniles in the city—treatment which seems particularly dangerous in view of the obvious long-term social costs. For example, a white high school student who was with the Juvenile Aid Division last spring as a volunteer in connection with a school project witnessed police beatings of two young burglary suspects. One policeman told him he preferred his hands to a blackjack because there is "no blood." He also said "Juveniles have no rights."

The Federal court has decided against the plaintiffs in the recent litigation, having first thrown out much of the case as inappropriate for a three-judge court. The judgment noted however that "Although the subject of excessive police force on November 17 is not before us, all citizens must be concerned at the extensive testimony on this subject." These judicious words are not likely to be heeded. Rizzo has become a popular hero. His words, recorded on television after he and his men broke the demonstration up—"there'll be no screams about police brutality; that's not going to happen, that I promise"—are the words white citizens want to believe as racial tensions mount in Philadelphia.

MICHELLE OSBORN

● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●

REVIEWERS

STAUGHTON LYND is the author of *Non-Violence in America.*

FATHER ANSELM ATKINS, O.C.S.O., is an artist who also contributes articles on philosophy to various journals.

MARC LANDY is co-editor of *The Activist.*

ONLY PRIESTS OF DEEP HUMANITY AND EXPERIENCE WILL EFFECTIVELY SERVE MODERN MAN IN HIS DISCRIMINATING, FAST-MOVING WORLD

If you, as a mature adult, view present transformations in the Church as a period of great promise, and if you are willing to dedicate your life to the realization of this promise, then you belong at

Holy Apostles Seminary

Founded in 1956, ours was the first American college designed specifically for adult aspirants to the diocesan and religious clergy. Holy Apostles is conducted by the Missionaries of the Holy Apostles who are specialists of long experience in adult vocation work. Thoroughly post-Conciliar in spirit, curriculum and orientation, the Seminary is fully accredited and offers its own Bachelor of Arts degree.

The curriculum includes

- *Accelerated Latin for Beginners*
- *Two Years of Liberal Arts*
- *Two Years of Philosophy and Social Studies*

Students who are interested in following only one or two sections of our academic program before transfer to their final clerical destinations are welcome, although residence of two years is required. Earliest age for admission is twenty years, and sponsorship by a diocese or religious order is required only for applicants who are forty years of age or over. Individual curricula are worked out to meet the specific needs of each student.
Our academic program is also open to non-resident lay students.

For further information write to

Dean of Admissions
Holy Apostles Seminary
Box 20
Cromwell, Conn. 06416

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We didn't cover the ground-breaking ceremony

(Our staff was busy breaking new ground)

We leave the trivia to others. National Catholic Reporter is a real newspaper dedicated to finding out what's happening in the Church and in society that's significant, so we can tell our readers.

We dig for all the facts we can get, so that 20th century Catholics can base their actions on knowledge. We never bury news because it might offend someone important.

Our staff of professional editors and correspondents gives full and consistent coverage to such issues as changing thought on birth control and celibacy, the increasingly aggressive posture of the peace and civil rights movements, the crisis of authority in the Church.

We publish significant in-depth articles like "Negro Violence and White Non-Violence" by Thomas Merton, "Adolescents and Today's Crisis of Faith" by Brother Gabriel Moran, F.S.C., or "The G.I. Who Wouldn't Cry 'Kill' " by Daniel Berrigan, S.J. We finance news-making surveys on important questions, such as the Fichter study of the attitudes of the rank-and-file Catholic clergy.

Our ecumenical columnists—Lutheran theologian Martin Marty and Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg—are always stimulating. The wry wit of "Cry Pax, a Column Without Rules" and the satirical cartoons of Jules Feiffer handle important themes in a diverting manner.

National Catholic Reporter's editorial and news pages—as you may have noticed—are widely quoted in other newspapers and magazines throughout the nation.

We're not afraid to call a spade a spade.

CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP

Special Offer! Subscribe now and save $2

Please enter my subscription to National Catholic Reporter at the special introductory rate for new subscribers of only $6 ($2 off regular price). Canadian postage $2.00 additional Foreign postage $2.75 additional

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

☐ Payment enclosed

☐ Please bill me

NATIONAL CATHOLIC REPORTER

Box 281 Kansas City, Missouri 64141

CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP – CLIP

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED